

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

PIN	5540	COUNTY	Los Angeles
APPLICANT	West Basin Municipal Water District	AMOUNT REQUESTED	\$479,555
PROJECT TITLE	Los Angeles County South Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Plan	TOTAL PROJECT COST	\$1,330,304

PROJECT DESCRIPTION

The Los Angeles County South Bay Integrated Regional Water Management Group, operating under the lead agency authority of the West Basin Municipal Water District, is developing a formal Integrated Regional Water Management Plan for a region including the Ballona Creek, Dominguez, and South Santa Monica Bay Watersheds. To date, there has been a significant amount of research, planning, and project development that has taken place in the Region. This submittal is part of a long-term strategy to integrate water and watershed management planning efforts across the Los Angeles region, including the watersheds of the San Gabriel River, Los Angeles River, Ballona Creek, Dominguez Channel, and Santa Monica Bay from Arroyo Sequit to the Palos Verdes peninsula. The agencies and stakeholders in the Region are preparing an IRWMP with the understanding that through regional integration, more cost effective and broader-reaching water management solutions can be developed and implemented.

WORK PLAN - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has a detailed and specific work plan that adequately documents the proposal. Weighting factor is 3.

Score: 9

Comment: The work plan included specific work items. The budget is broken down by task then summarized for the whole project; however, it does not appear to be reasonable with a labor rate of \$150 per hour. This rate was not supported with other documentation, assumptions, or figures. The work plan seems implementable. Obviously, some planning documents have already been prepared by participating agencies, and those documents will be used and developed to serve the IRWMP. Deliverables are not always identified. Although the schedule indicated that the IRWMP will be adopted prior to January 2007, it is questioned whether the entire proposal can be completed in one year as proposed by the applicant.

DESCRIPTION OF REGION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented a detailed and specific description that adequately documents the region. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The applicant describes the region in detail and provides maps embedded in the work plan and GIS files. The basis for the region was not clearly defined. In addition, the proposal described the RWMG responsible for development of the proposed IRWMP. The proposal, however, does not contain any description of important ecological processes, environmental resources, the social and cultural makeup of the regional community, nor does it identify important cultural or social values and economic conditions and trends within the region. The applicant did not provide a description of internal boundaries to the region, major water related infrastructure, and major land-use divisions within the region. Some description of water quality in the region is provided.

OBJECTIVES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific planning objectives. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 6

Comment: The applicant provided objectives for each watershed, but no detailed discussion of how the objectives will be achieved or if they are in the process of being implemented. The proposal only provides a brief explanation of the regional planning objectives and makes no indication of how those objectives were determined. The proposal also fails to address major water related objectives and conflicts in the region including water supply, groundwater management, ecosystem restoration, and water quality. The applicant maintained focus on statewide priorities throughout the plan; however, no supporting documentation was provided.

INTEGRATION OF WATER MANAGEMENT STRATEGIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented how water management strategies will be integrated. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 8

Comment: The proposal addressed multiple water management strategies or a technical process to determine water management strategies. In addition, the applicant demonstrates an understanding of how the selected water management strategies work together to produce some synergistic effect in water management. The proposal, however, does not provide a clear strategy on how to integrate all the existing water management plans or watershed management plans into the IRWMP. The applicant provided a discussion on studies completed to date and how these studies address regional objectives and integrate regional water management. The management strategies to be considered meet the IRWMP standards.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

IMPLEMENTATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately detailed plan implementation. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: Task 5 will compile implementation plans; highlight coordination opportunities; and address the adoption, management, financing, and outstanding data management issues in association with the existing plans. The proposal does not have a schedule for implementation of the IRWMP beyond adoption. The applicant did not include, nor will it develop, an institutional structure to ensure project implementation. The proposal only describes implementation of water management plans on the local level without an indication of implementation of the IRWMP. In addition, there is no mechanism or process in the proposal that allows for monitoring the performance of the IRWMP implementation and changes to the IRWMP.

IMPACTS AND BENEFITS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately presented and documented the impacts and benefits of the Plan. Weighting factor is 2.

Score: 4

Comment: The applicant mentioned the "Integrated Plan for the Wastewater Program." The applicant also mentioned the "Integrated Resources Plan for the Wastewater Program: Facilities Plan Volumes 1-4," which presents impacts and benefits of the comprehensive basin-wide water resources planning efforts contained in the plans; however, these documents were not found in the application. There was no mention of CEQA in the application and there was no analysis of potential benefits of developing the proposed IRWMP.

DATA AND TECHNICAL ANALYSIS - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data and technical analysis components of the proposal. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: There is no mention that the available data will adequately support the proposed planning effort. According to the proposal, technical studies have been conducted; however, those studies are limited to specific areas and not consistently addressed across the region. Furthermore, there is no mention of any planned technical studies that will support the proposed planning effort. The applicant mentioned few other regional reports available that provide strong technical analysis in areas such as water supply reliability and stormwater management. None of these documents were provided.

DATA MANAGEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has presented detailed and specific data management procedures. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant only mentioned that data management discussion was included in most water quality, stormwater management, and water supply management reports. The proposal itself does not include a process for gathering and managing data from development and implementation of the IRWMP. In addition, the proposal only indicates that dissemination of data has not been consistently practiced, but makes no mention of any process for disseminating data to stakeholders, agencies, and the public.

STAKEHOLDER INVOLVEMENT - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented stakeholder involvement concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: The full stakeholder group will meet quarterly; however, the proposal does not identify specific processes for stakeholder involvement in IRWMP development and implementation, including how they may influence decisions. There is also no mention of whether all related entities within the region are included in the planning process. Although all appropriate stakeholders appear to have been included in the proposal, there is no description of a process to identify and to include additional stakeholders. The public appears to be involved after planning is determined by the stakeholders. Additionally, the proposal does not address any environmental justice concerns.

DISADVANTAGE COMMUNITIES - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented disadvantaged community concerns. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: Existing planning documentation does not address impacts to DACs on the regional level; however, the region has several areas that can be defined as DACs. These areas include Inglewood, Hawthorne, and West Athens. There is no mention of how the water supply or water quality needs of DACs will be addressed by the IRWMP. Also, the implementation of the proposal does not appear to directly benefit the DACs. There was no discussion of how the DACs were determined.

RELATION TO LOCAL PLANNING - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented the Plan's relationship to local planning efforts. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 3

Comment: A listing of documents that will form the foundation for the IRWMP is provided. The application did not indicate how the documents will relate to the IRWM water management strategies and the dynamics between the two levels of planning documents.

PROPOSAL EVALUATION

Proposition 50, Chapter 8 Integrated Regional Water Management Planning Grant

AGENCY COORDINATION - Scoring will be based on whether the applicant has adequately documented agency coordination issues. Weighting factor is 1.

Score: 2

Comment: The applicant mentioned coordination with the other stakeholders, but did not mention coordination with State and federal agencies. Documentation was only mentioned but was not provided.

TOTAL SCORE: 48